

**ARIZONA STATE PARKS BOARD  
ALAMO LAKE STATE PARK  
37 MILES N OF WENDEN & US 60  
OCTOBER 20, 2005  
MINUTES**

**Board Members Present**

Elizabeth Stewart  
William Porter  
William Cordasco  
Janice Chilton  
John Hays

**Board Members Absent**

William Scalzo  
Mark Winkleman

**Staff Members Present**

Ken Travous, Executive Director  
Jay Ream, Assistant Director, Parks  
Jay Ziemann, Assistant Director, Partnerships and External Affairs  
Mark Siegwarth, Assistant Director, Administration  
Cristi Statler, Executive Consultant  
Debi Busser, Executive Secretary

**Attorney General's Office**

Patricia Boland, Assistant Attorney General

**A. CALL TO ORDER – ROLL CALL**

Chairman Stewart called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m. Roll Call indicated a quorum was present.

**B. INTRODUCTIONS OF BOARD MEMBERS AND AGENCY STAFF**

The Board and staff introduced themselves.

**C. WELCOME TO ALAMO LAKE STATE PARK**

Mr. Carl Brooks, Park Manager of Alamo Lake State Park, reported that he has been with Arizona State Parks (ASP) for 27 years. He started in July 1978 at Alamo Lake State Park. The park has 5 full time staff who all live at the park. The park itself encompasses 7,000 acres with all of that being either BLM leases or Corps of Engineer leases. Within the main part of the park, which was built first, are 250 campsites with 3 shower buildings, 2 dump stations, and 2 fish cleaning stations. The attraction to the park is fishing – bass, catfish, croppie. People used to come to the park for bass fishing, but now it's probably swung more to the croppie fishing because they are easier to catch.

Mr. Brooks noted that the lake is about 4,000 surface acres now. Last fall when Hurricane Xavier showed up the lake was at about 1,100 surface acres. The lake rose about 100' in elevation last fall and winter because of all of the storms that came

through. Since that time, the lake has dropped about 40'. The lake is still carrying about 60 additional feet than it has in quite some time. Last year was the lowest the lake had been in 25 years.

Chairman Stewart asked if the lake is back to "normal".

Mr. Brooks responded that the lake is currently standing a little bit above the targeted elevation, which is 1,125'. The lake is currently at about 1,133'. He convinced the Corps of Engineers to drop the lake down to 1,135' in order to be able to use the Cholla Ramp, which should help visitation. It depends of what kind of winter we have.

Mr. Ream asked how many days it took for the lake to gain that 100'.

Mr. Brooks responded that a series of storms moved through the area; it seemed like it was raining every weekend. The lake, when it was small, was jumping about 14' over night. When Xavier showed up and the lake rose 7' just the top of the portable boat ramp they had out in the lake was showing. They had to tow it out of the lake and park it. They haven't had to use it since, and staff hope it will be a long time before they have to use it again.

Mr. Brooks reported that visitation is tied to the lake. If the lake is up and fishing is good, they get 80,000 visitors per year. When the lake is low, visitation drops down to about 60,000.

Chairman Stewart asked when the main season occurs.

Mr. Brooks responded that the busiest time begins in late February and runs until the end of March. They are busy all week. In May, they are busy on the weekends. After May, there's not very much activity through the summer.

Chairman Stewart asked if the parks fills all 250 of the campsites.

Mr. Brooks responded that staff have not turned anyone away in 5 years. The camp area on Cholla Road has been nearly full when everything else was full. About 3 years ago when the lake was higher and fishing was good, he recalls making deposits of \$17,000 for the week. He hopes to get back to that level again. The fishing has been really good. The mercury warning that came out several years ago was not helpful. It was one of those kinds of things where the more it goes on the less people will worry about it. The amount of mercury in the fish exceeds the Food and Drug Administration's (FDA) recommended level. It basically states that women of child-bearing age should not eat more than an 8 oz. fillet; children under 6 should not eat the fish at all. He usually tells people who ask that the amount of mercury has not appreciably changed in the fish for all these years; the FDA lowered the standards.

Mr. Brooks reported that Project 11 added 40 new electrical sites that have been very popular. Current projects include trying to get a new concessionaire store at the park and cabins. They plan to start with 4 cabins that will be placed on either side of the shower building in the campground area. There was some road damage from a microburst over the summer. He has been working with DEMA (the state's version of FEMA) to fund repairs to the road that goes up to the dam that was washed out on the downstream side. It also appears that they will fund repairs to a turnaround.

Mr. Porter asked if ASP owns any land whatsoever at this park.

Mr. Ream responded that the agency owns very little park land in the entire system. The agency either leases or has land under patent with the BLM under the R and PP. So long as the land is being used for recreational purposes it is, for all intents and purposes, the Board's land. If it ceases to be used for the purposes it was leased or gift patented, it reverts back to the BLM. We are on a lease here. Because of the make-up of this being flood control and the Corps of Engineers having their portion, staff have not applied for a patent with the BLM and just continue our lease.

Chairman Stewart noted that another 25-year lease was signed a couple of years ago.

Mr. Ream added that the Board has patents at Lake Havasu.

Chairman Stewart noted that even in the parks that the Board owns, the amount of land the Board actually owns is generally fairly small.

Mr. Ream added that the Board owns 19 acres at Catalina.

Mr. Porter noted that he wasn't aware that the Board has parks where it doesn't own even a sliver of land.

Mr. Ream stated he worked at Alamo Lake for a little under 2.5 years. A lot of people spend a lot of time with ASP before they get to Alamo Lake. He thinks it's terrific that the Board is having this meeting here. It's not convenient for anyone; people don't come to this park unless they have to.

Chairman Stewart noted that this is a beautiful park; it's one of the hidden gems that more people would come if they knew about it.

Mr. Travous noted that there was a concessionaire at Alamo Lake for a long time. He ran the bait shop. He sold it to a former employee who took it over just as the lake was going down. That employee went bankrupt. Staff have tried unsuccessfully every way possible to get a concessionaire at this park. Mr. Brooks and his staff, because they know the meaning of public service, have taken on fishing licenses, minnows (people come out not knowing the concessionaire is no longer here), and other tasks that goes on unseen for all too long. He thanked Mr. Brooks and his staff for the job they do. He thanked the Board for coming to the park; he believes this is the first time a Board has ever met at Alamo Lake.

#### **D. CONSENT AGENDA**

- 1. Approve Minutes of September 15, 2005 Arizona State Parks Board Meeting**
- 2. Approve Executive Session Minutes of September 15, 2005 Arizona State Parks Board Meeting**
- 3. Consider Approving State Trails System Nominations** – Staff and ASCOT recommend the 10 trails listed in the table contained in the Board Packet for inclusion into the State Trails System.

Mr. Porter made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda. Mr. Cordasco seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

## E. BOARD ACTION ITEMS

1. **Vision and Design, PAMS, and Strategic Plan** – The Board will discuss these items. Staff recommends that the Board approve the Vision and Design Plan.

Chairman Stewart stated that she and the Executive Director have tried to choose a topic for each meeting for the Board to have the opportunity to discuss in depth. The topic for this meeting is to look at the Vision and Design, PAMS, and the Strategic Plan. She reminded that Board that in February 2003 there was a two-day retreat that was at the tail-end of a series of one-day meetings for strategic planning. The Board came up with a list of 6 possible critical objectives and strategies for implementation. That information is included in the Board packet beginning at page 2. At that 2-day retreat the Board ended up discharging the facilitator without really finalizing the strategic plan for a variety of reasons, including the fact that a number of new members joined the Board and it seemed to be better to integrate everyone into the Board before proceeding. It is also difficult to get everyone together for additional meetings. Mr. Travous spent a lot of time putting the Vision and Design together to move this new Vision forward. The Board and staff spent a lot time on the retreat meetings; it is important to make sure that all of the items that were determined to be critical (those with 4-5 asterisks) are being moved forward.

Chairman Stewart noted that when the Board met in Patagonia and reviewed the Vision and Design, they made several specific suggestions (in terms of language and additions). Some were incorporated and some were not. She wants to make sure those items are included.

Chairman Stewart stated that, in looking at the new Vision and the strategic planning information, she believes the cornerstone was to develop Goals and Objectives for the science programs to include in Critical Objective 1 to expand the ecological and scientific knowledge base through staff and consultants. One of the strategies was to develop goals and objectives for science programs including the implementation of PAMS. She believes that the Board recognizes that PAMS is one tool to accomplish the other point that we need to make informed decisions and that we need to base our decisions on hard knowledge. There was an excellent presentation at the September meeting from staff on PAMS. They were very well prepared and very knowledgeable and enthusiastic. She believes the Board was very impressed with that fine presentation. Additionally, Dr. Toomey made an excellent presentation on the cave. Toward the end of that presentation, one of his recommendations was to apply high science-informed standards. He explained to the Board that he did not believe one could make science-based decisions in the real world, but that it was important to make science-informed decisions at all parks in terms of research, education, and resource management and continue to expand and improve and update the information base on all parks to improve education managed with stewardship and operation and to manage adaptively. She believes that those things all dove-tail. The question for the Board today is whether the Vision and Design as currently written capture the essence of the strategic meetings the Board had and ensure the achievement of the new Vision.

Mr. Cordasco stated that he is interested in getting a feel from staff as to how they feel about it, whether it is overburdening them with its challenges, and how it is integrating.

Mr. Ream responded that PAMS is changing how Resource Management is run. Resource Management was begun with the addition of Dr. Toomey to the agency and how that science was managed. PAMS flowed from that. It is changing the agency because this first phase of PAMS has been directed toward the library – the hardware that the Board saw in September. It has been run by committee. The lead on that has been Mr. McNeil, who knows how to build libraries. As that library comes together to about 75%-80% it is at the point where we need a Librarian. Staff are getting ready to hire a PAMS Manager. The question is who this PAMS Manager works for – is it an Admin person (most statistics are entered by Admin staff), is it a “computer person”, or is it on the Resource Management side. This is the difficulty staff were having. The issue has been solved somewhat. An offer has been made to a candidate to replace Dr. Toomey. Dr. Toomey was hired as the Cave Resource Manager. Dr. Toomey’s abilities made him the science manager for the Resource Management section; he evolved the Cave Resource Manager into the Science Manager. When looking for his replacement, staff looked for someone who could fill that role as Science Manager. Staff now believe they can let this position out for the PAMS Resource Manager and assign it to the science link. The discussion took place on Tuesday.

Mr. Porter asked if it would be a separate position under the Science Manager.

Mr. Ream responded affirmatively.

Chairman Stewart stated it makes more sense. This is really a tool to achieve the science.

Mr. Siegwarth noted that he was unaware of this discussion. The other viewpoint is that Resource Management is very horizontal. There is a biologist, an archeologist, a water expert, a wastewater expert and everyone is looking at PAMS for their own usage. When it came to a Librarian position, one of the issues was whether this would be just another layer of management who will join the fray and try to get their things in first. The other solution that was discussed was that perhaps Executive Staff would set the priorities for the Librarian and free that person from those decisions and have that person work in Computer Support being in charge of working with Mr. Sejkora on water issues and getting it into PAMS. When reports or analyses need to be done, that person would help pull that information for those designated staff who need it. This person would be skilled in getting all of Mr. Sejkora’s data and putting it into PAMS and then help him pull it out when needed. We don’t have the luxury of just having managers; everyone sitting before the Board is a working manager. That’s part of the issue.

Mr. Siegwarth noted that the climbing park is an illustration of how far the agency has come. Staff have almost completed an Environmental Assessment. Staff are also working on a more in-depth cultural (Class III) survey. Staff are working on a more in-depth biological survey. Interdisciplinary meetings are being held to make sure that when the development is done and everything is planned out that all these things have been taken into account. When staff actually presented the rock climbing park proposal to the Board, there were a lot of maps and data that addressed natural, cultural, and recreational issues. He believes staff’s thinking has changed quite a bit. There are a lot of internal discussions about trails. Staff are waiting to make a lot of these decisions

until the data on which to do it is available. In the past, staff made a decision that a trail looked good and made sense. Even though staff may have been right in the past, they are now waiting for these reports to come down before finalizing things.

Mr. Ream noted that an unanticipated event of doing this science informed decision-making is where staff would normally say there is a trail and fund the trail construction, staff are now looking at a price tag of \$60,000 to do the scientific analysis on this land before cutting that trail. Staff don't want to do that until we have a solid lease (it would not be a good use of public money). Everyone wants to know all that information before we have a lease. Staff are in a bit of a quandry. Staff will make a lease application, get some sort of control over the land, and then begin the process. He doesn't have \$60,000 for this right now. Those are the kinds of things that brings a new layer of budget to the science informed decision-making.

Mr. Cordasco referred to the Librarian position. He noted that in some ways to make that important decision everyone is talking about, either Resource Management staff will determine what's going on or the legislative staff will determine what's going on or the Comptroller will determine what's going on, etc. He wants to make sure that's not the option. Perhaps one of the options to be considered is that that person is really as equal in their value and decision-making with anyone else when it comes down to it. He asked what level the position would be.

Mr. Porter noted that Mr. Cordasco is mirroring his thoughts. He stated that he doesn't really care where that position falls within the system as long as that position does not get lost in the shuffle and become some little "Do Bee" somewhere down the pipeline. It is too important. This person needs to be in a position where the entire agency is not only aware of it but has ready conduits into it and where it will not suddenly be at the mercy of one section or another where PAMS gets hurt or damaged or shunted off. While that is a concern, he is so pleased to be hearing what he's hearing. It's not just lip service to the concept that this is going to change the way we do business or it is going to change the way we think. What he's hearing is concrete. It's clear. Yes, it's different and staff are having a difficult time figuring out the conduits; however, the thought processes are there. That was the big break over the dam. This is the first time since that retreat at Tonto when the Board jumped into PAMS, that he is hearing concrete fruit. He is delighted; it is a change in thinking. This is the way these things have to be looked at. It will be costly. His guess is that, over the years, it will save the Board a ton of money by better planning, more efficient and effective use of the parks, probably better attendance, more effective experiences by the public we are serving. We will have put the kind of planning in thought. Rather than saying this looks like a nice trail, let's put some money into it, it is asking if this is the trail that is going to most appeal to our clients and will give them the best experience and satisfaction in what staff eventually want this trail to be used for. It may be discovered that it is a beautiful trail but it won't be as good as another.

Mr. Travous noted that the conversations the Board is hearing from staff is where he comes in and tries to keep those conversations going. He stated that, in his mind, from the time of that Board meeting in 2003 to now it has been a sequence of revolution and then evolution and then revolution and evolution. The first revolution was the Board

saying that we need to look at being the best resource people. Staff went through the process of trying to figure out what that meant. Changes were made. He believes it will take staff some time, but he thinks staff are over the first major hurdle and, internally, he believes there is enough organizational buy-in that he doesn't see any turning back. He has been asked to talk about the Vision and Design at the Teamwork/Training Conference next week. Staff are interested in hearing about it.

Mr. Travous added that sometimes there is frustration. People, with good intentions, can come to different conclusions. When it comes to where we put this Librarian position, the question he's hearing today is how to elevate this position without making it "the king". It's a balance. Staff liked Dr. Toomey's statement that "science-based" can get one in a lot of trouble. He noted that he is a scientist. He knows that one can always peel the onion a little finer. "Science-informed" tells us that we are trying to get the information as best as possible before the decision gets made. There will be decisions that will have to be made before all the information is available. He believes it will get easier for staff and it won't be as expensive once this library is up. Staff won't have to farm so much of this work out. We'll have a good foundation in place and can then begin adding bricks to that foundation.

Mr. Porter stated that he can see, probably years down the road (if we are successful in getting PAMS where we want it and are, in fact, the best at what we're doing in that regard), taking on projects for outside entities that could provide a nice, lucrative income for the agency, to put that experience and that capability and our templates and skills into helping others do that sort of thing. He believes that will be the point at which he will be able to sit back and say that we have finally gotten to that point because we are now recognized as excellent enough to be the best in this area that others want to learn from us.

Mr. Travous responded that he believes the agency is already recognized in two places. One is Kartchner Caverns State Park (KCSP). Nobody does that better than us. The other is water-based recreation management. People come to staff because we know how to manage water-based recreation. Staff grew up doing it.

Chairman Stewart noted that one of the questions going forward is how to apply those standards to all of the rest of the parks. There is a difference between the standard employed at KCSP and some of the other parks. The Board realizes, too, that there are some realities and some economics involved. She has always seen the new Vision as being finding a way to apply the KCSP standard system-wide.

Mr. Travous responded that that's what staff talk about internally. The agency has set itself a standard of excellence at KCSP that needs to be set in everything it does.

Chairman Stewart added that it is reality-based when it's science-informed. If it were science-based, the caverns might not be open. It is a good example of how both can be done with the least impact within a reasonable budget. It does provide something to aspire to. She had a discussion with Mr. Ream a few months ago where he said there are two ways to implement the Vision. We can either change the way we operate the agency or we can change the packaging. She asked if staff are saying they chose to change how things are done as opposed to just the packaging.

Mr. Travous responded that there are two ways to build a bonfire. One is to keep stacking up wood and hoping lightening strikes it; the other is to build a little fire and keep chucking stuff on it. He believes staff have a little fire going and need to keep chucking wood on it. We get the little things done and take the experience and keep chucking things on it. He believes that's what staff are doing.

Mr. Siegwarth added that he believes staff have heard what the Board has said. That's one of the reasons the Exhibits Specialist was hired – to focus on that aspect of the organization and bring that level up higher. The Board will see some of his work next month in Yuma. He believes staff saw that that needed to be spread through all of the parks. He believes that with the historic parks, in addition to the actual bricks and mortar being fixed, the exhibits were an issue. Staff worked with SHPO to make some funding available to hire this person and begin work on the exhibits.

Mr. Ream noted that the National Parks Service (NPS) is going through this transition right now. President Clinton told the NPS to not do anything to a National Park for the people that would hurt the resource. They put themselves in a position of closing areas to the public because so many people were going and it was having a detrimental affect to the resource. It was internal to each historic or preservation park. President Bush has reversed that direction. He is putting the people first and the resource is now second. He believes there are some people who are struggling very hard with this. It is an issue that staff are beginning to struggle with now. It was solved at KCSP by saying exactly how many people will go through. It has not been done at the other parks. There are more and more people coming to Arizona. He is interested in seeing how this plays out for the NPS and whether the next president changes the direction back. He believes this agency will have to face this same struggle in the near future. It will be the Board's decision.

Mr. Cordasco stated that he believes that is the greatest opportunity ASP has. He also thinks that ASP has the flexibility that the NPS does not have – to go and be the leaders so ASP can tell them what to do. They will watch staff figure it out. He also sees it as not being a one way or the other. Clinton can say one way and Bush can say it another. As staff suggested, the Board is going to have to make this decision. As long as it is deliberate, based on the information provided, then we're good to go. He believes that's the balance. Staff may find some endangered species someplace. Staff may also recognize that this is in the middle of Phoenix and is going to get trampled by a lot of people. Economically it's a big boon for the agency. Legislatively it pulls in everyone's support. But staff know there's an endangered species there. What's the answer going to be? Might it be, "No". In another area, staff might say the opposite. At least the information is there to make that deliberate decision. That's his ultimate goal. That's all staff is doing. There is no "king" of the deal. Sometimes economics might win out; sometimes legislative concerns will win out; sometimes environmental concerns might win out. It would be great if all three balanced out, but they don't have to be equal.

Mr. Ream added that this Board will have to make those balances all the time. There will be pressure from whoever is governor.

Mr. Porter noted that we are somewhat fortunate in Arizona because of the fact that Arizona has just about the weakest governorship in the country – and it was intentional

back in 1912 when it was put together. They were influenced by the minimalist movement on government out of Wisconsin. They deliberately created the weakest chief executive they could. Most of the major departments don't really report directly to the Governor on a day-to-day basis. The Governor can pick up the phone and tell a lot of people in Arizona what she wants done, and they are very much at liberty to tell the Governor, "Sorry". ASP is kind of in the middle of that in the sense that any time there is an independently-appointed Board, once it's appointed and confirmed, in reality and legally the Governor cannot pick up the phone and tell this Board what we must do. There are states in which the governor could do that with impunity. That doesn't mean this Board wants to go off on a tangent – far from it. This Board has always wanted a good working relationship with the Governor. However, he doesn't believe the Board has that same problem. There are other factors in Arizona that enable the Board to make these decisions with a broader picture. He doesn't think that the federal government pays much attention as to what their decisions do to the local economies around the national parks. That is something the Board always has to pay very close attention to. Our parks very frequently drive the local economies. He noted that the very small town of Wenden touts itself as the Gateway to Alamo Lake State Park. The Board certainly saw firsthand, when they began talking about closing parks or limiting their hours a few years ago, how the locals poured forth with their reaction because the Board was stopping things that were very important to their local economies. The Board knew that, but needed to make sure that other people in the decision-making process became aware of it. The Board will have to face those issues.

Ms. Boland arrived at the meeting at 10:55 a.m.

Mr. Cordasco noted that it's not what you think you know that makes you so smart; it's what you don't know that makes you a darn fool. Patagonia Lake might be an interesting example. There might be some great economic data associated with Patagonia Lake; there might be some great recreational data associated with Patagonia Lake; there may be other information he doesn't know about (legislatively or support). He asked if there is a list of the birds that live there. That is the kind of thing that needs to be harnessed in the decision-making process where there are discussions and decisions have to be made. The Board needs to have that type of information brought across the table. It doesn't mean that one or the other, because it's stronger, wins. At least the Board understands the situation and be more deliberate about whether it's planning processes or a particular decision that needs to be made.

Mr. Cordasco added that when the Board and staff had those discussions in February 2003 we were talking in terms of where we were hoping to get to. He believes that Mr. Travous raised the point that it's frustrating right now. There's nothing wrong with that. In many ways we have to greatly appreciate that. Patience is probably going to be the key right now. Determining where the Librarian position fits in the agency might be a situation where it needs to sit, have some discussions, and let it find itself. This is probably an appropriate time to be patient.

Mr. Cordasco noted that the Chairman has been referring to the "new Vision". He was hopeful that at some point it would become "the Vision".

Chairman Stewart noted that is a good point. It has been almost two years. This is an excellent time to drop the word "new". Until this discussion today, she felt that perhaps some of the Board members were not sure that it was the Vision. She believes that the Board has gotten assurances that this has in fact been documented and implemented as opposed to changing the packaging.

Mr. Hays referred to the earlier discussion relating to growth in Arizona and whether attendance at parks should be limited. He noted that Critical Objective 6 (page 6 of the Board packet) which is expansion or increasing the number of parks is something the Board must really think about despite the legislative non-support. He believes that this is one of the most important objectives to concentrate on for the next five years.

Arizona is getting overcrowded. Patagonia Lake is a perfect example of what the Board will be facing.

Chairman Stewart stated that, along those lines, it is critically important to protect our existing parks. As she's traveled around the state and visited all of the parks, she always asks what land the Board owns and what adjacent land the park relies on to remain the same use. There are a lot of parks where if the uses of the adjacent land changed, the park as we know it today would be destroyed. It is important to acquire new properties; but it's equally or perhaps more important to protect what we have. She believes the East Valley (Apache Junction and Mesa) grew a lot faster than most people thought it would. She believes that the Board will find that happening at some of our parks. Mr. Hays is absolutely correct.

Mr. Hays added that Dead Horse Ranch State Park is one of the most desirable areas. He asked if Dead Horse is becoming like Patagonia Lake in regard to over-usage and over-demand.

Mr. Ream responded it is not yet a problem.

Mr. Hays stated that he believes Dead Horse will be the next Patagonia Lake. It's a shame we don't have six more parks like it. It seems to be very popular.

Mr. Ream responded that he hopes PAMS will clarify how to handle those resources. We're not at that stage at Dead Horse and are, hopefully, ahead of it. Staff knows it's coming. All these people who have moved into the valley will eventually have their backyards finished and remodeling done and then they will start venturing out to see their new state. That's when we'll see the push.

Mr. Porter stated that the Board will have to confront that issue immediately with Lake Havasu. It is critical. It's not so much an issue there of overcrowding in the sense of not having enough lake. The problem there is a lack of facilities. That's something that needs to really be talked about philosophically with the City of Lake Havasu to see where they are coming from. There will have to be a partnership there. All sorts of entities will have to come together and put together a cohesive plan on what needs to be built, what needs to be done, how the structure can be changed to accommodate not only the current needs but hopefully plan ahead recognizing that we are just seeing the beginning of the curve. It's not going to get any better. There will be more and more demand on that facility. Right now we are at that point where conditions are becoming dangerous. That will be a good test. He doesn't know how well the Board would have

addressed these issues at Lake Havasu or the climbing park before this process began. He suggested staff are probably approaching it and thinking differently about them than they would have a couple of years ago.

Mr. Travous responded that there are people assigned to it who never thought they would be involved in something like this.

Mr. Porter stated that he is very happy with what he sees.

Chairman Stewart noted that Mr. Hays brought up another objective that was rated highly – to evaluate opportunities for properties to obtain and/or manage. The two strategies that had the most stars were to examine State Trust lands which are designated for conservation and evaluate current properties in order to protect them from encroachment or to enhance current uses. She noted that at that time there was a different initiative from the current initiative.

Mr. Cordasco asked whether or not ASP has a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the State Land Department (SLD).

Mr. Travous responded that ASP has leases from the SLD.

Mr. Cordasco asked whether there are any MOUs with the SLD. With the PAMS project and the resources available, SLD uses the same information ASP does. Having an MOU with SLD that allows for ASP to have the opportunity to collect that science and data for SLD and for the benefit of a regional perspective within the park area would be beneficial.

Mr. Travous responded that the agency's archeological sites (AZSITE) are on SLD's land base computer. There is a partnership with them on that.

Mr. Siegwarth added that work is being done on an agreement where someone will fly the entire state and GIS it down to a meter's accuracy. SLD has taken the lead on that effort. ASP and several agencies are kicking in money so it will be available to all agencies. Staff have been working very closely with them. That is one of the benefits of having an office in the basement of the SLD's building. Their GIS staff are just down the hall and have been working very closely with ASP staff on a lot of this.

Mr. Cordasco stated that he was thinking in terms more site-specific. Picacho Peak State Park has some state land around it. Having MOUs that tie those lands together from a regional perspective for the purposes of collecting science might be real handy to have.

Mr. Porter suggested that would also apply to Game and Fish. There are a lot of parks that are close to their activities.

Mr. Travous noted that SLD generally doesn't do much management. They generally come to ASP.

Mr. Ream added that we do have a reciprocal agreement for fire fighting with SLD.

Chairman Stewart noted that there are a couple of other items rated highly that she wanted to point out before moving on to the Vision and Design. Critical Objective 2 (page 5 of the Board packet), to expand the cultural resource knowledge base. The

strategy to develop goals and objectives for cultural resources received 4 stars. Critical Objective 3, work to make the organization more effective and efficient. Strategy 3.b. – strengthen respect and cooperation with governor’s office, the legislature and other outside groups – received 5 stars. Strategy 3.d. – evaluate grant programs so that they may become vision focused – received 6 stars. She believes staff have been doing a fair amount with the Governor’s Office and outside groups and trying with the legislature. There was something in the Strategic Plan about evaluating the grant programs so they would be vision focused. The Board decided in Patagonia that they weren’t going to pay any attention to the Strategic Plan and would put what the Board was interested in in the Vision and Design. She feels something needs to be placed in the Vision and Design that duplicates what is in the Strategic Plan. Staff could probably just pick up this bullet from the Critical Objectives relating to evaluating the grant programs. She believes a schedule is already set up for that issue. That bullet, along with the dates, could be added to the Vision and Design. She believes it will be handy for the Board to have everything in one place. As the Board receives updates, it makes it easier to get information on where things stand. It also helps the Board to not forget about things. The Board discussed not wanting the Strategic Plan from the retreat ending up on a shelf.

Mr. Travous noted that he will provide an update on the Vision and Design in November. He has a sheet that has tasks to be completed by month.

Chairman Stewart added that the whole idea of having both of these documents in this Board packet was so that the Board didn’t reach a point six months or a year from now and discover there were things from the retreat that needed to get done and ask what happened to it.

Mr. Porter referred to Strategy 3.d. He asked to what extent the “revolution” has been exported down to the advisory and support groups who are the ones who look at the grant programs and make recommendations to the Board. He asked to what extent they have been brought in on where the Board has gone with the Vision.

Mr. Ziemann responded that staff have discussed these things with AORCC, HPAC, and the various committees and are now in the process with HPAC on the next round of grants. Applications are coming in. After staff see if they are good, bad, or indifferent staff will evaluate whether it is working or not. Objective 2:2B on the Vision and Design partners with AORCC and starts to incorporate the Vision in the grants. Staff are in the process of starting all that.

Chairman Stewart stated that she knows staff has dates targeted for that and would like it to be incorporated into the Vision and Design so that there is one document to look at.

Chairman Stewart stated that under Critical Objective 4 – fully develop the friends and fund raising program – she believes staff have been working on that. She believes reference is made to the Ambassador Program in the Vision and Design. She believes that was one of the things the Board talked about that would be helpful if staff fleshed the language out by explaining what the Ambassador Program is. It isn’t clear who is being brought together.

Mr. Cordasco referred to Critical Objective 4. He recalls when the Board and staff put stars on the strategies.

Chairman Stewart noted that the Board and staff had different colored stars. This document does not reflect whose stars were placed by which strategies. A lot of them were pretty close – PAMS and develop goals and objectives were 4 and 5. There was one – develop goals and objectives for cultural resources was 3 and 1. There was a bigger difference in some areas than others.

Mr. Cordasco stated that, after all is said and done, Critical Objective 4 is everything. The point to that is money. With that in mind, he asked if these priorities are ranked. Clearly, there are areas where one is greater than the other.

Chairman Stewart responded that the Board never adopted this document. The only reason she brought it up today was so the Board would have the opportunity to review it, taking into consideration that this was 2 years ago; the Board's composition was somewhat different; things could have changed; but there might be something in it that the Board would find was important then and feel it's still important.

Mr. Travous responded that the only thing the Board adopted was the Vision. However, there was still good information in this document. Staff have been talking about those things that need to be done that got the most stars. Staff saw where those areas of emphasis were. In the meantime, internally the staff can't drop what we're doing in order to move forward or we go economically bankrupt. Mr. Ream's job is to keep 30 parks open. Mr. Siegwarth's job is to keep the money flowing. Mr. Ziemann keeps the legislative process going. Ms. Statler's job is to find friends and funds. Staff tried to incorporate a lot of this in the standard Strategic Plan. It got so confusing that staff could have never kept track of it. Staff took the highlights and said here's what we're already doing and need to keep doing and these are the things that need to be tended to and tried to roll them into the Vision and Design. This is what staff believe they can do and should be doing over the next year. This is staff's work plan for the Board to hold them accountable over the next year. He would like to keep these two documents in tact. In April or May, look at how far the agency has moved and see what new logs can be thrown on the fire for the upcoming years.

Mr. Porter stated that, assuming he becomes Chairman of the Board next year, it is his intention to have a two-day meeting in the spring in order to have the time to sit down and do that again.

Chairman Stewart responded that she believes it is needed. It was too soon this year.

Mr. Cordasco noted that there was a great deal of effort by everyone to put the strategies together and consolidate the information. He suggested just getting rid of the stars for the meantime and focusing on those points. He would hate for the stars to drive that small fire and find out down the road that something got initiated ahead of time that wasn't necessarily a priority and other priorities needed to be put in place. He preferred to keep it a little more open for a while. He suggested being a little patient for now and letting some of these things work out. He noted that having stars in various places was done in 2003. He doesn't know that that is appropriate today given where

things have evolved. If we're going to have that meeting next spring, it seems fair to let staff have the freedom to not be guided by stars.

Chairman Stewart noted that perhaps she did not articulate what she was trying to do properly. When she talked about the stars, she thought that if the Board is adopting the Vision and Design then the Board wanted to at least make sure those items that rated high were somehow encompassed in that document. It wasn't to suggest that the Board either should or should not do the others; it was to see whether those items are included. She was not suggesting that the stars meant anything other than that a lot of people were saying they were important a couple of years ago. The intent was to end up with one document that the Board can focus on in terms of timelines. The Executive Director will be giving the Board reports on the Vision and Design, but he won't necessarily be giving the Board a report on all these separate documents.

Mr. Porter noted that, at the same time, the Vision and Design is a working document. He thinks that, at this point, whether the Board consciously stops being guided by the stars, nonetheless, at this point it has certainly almost become moot. The fact is that we have finally gotten over the hurdle and are moving and are beyond temporary; Mr. Cordasco's point is well-taken. He feels the Board should just move on down the road; there's a lot on the plate. That's one reason he wants to bring things to a screeching halt next spring, sit down (staff and Board), and take a hard look at it, re-evaluate where we were, what's been accomplished over the past 2-3 years, and see what was not moved on that perhaps should be re-examined.

Chairman Stewart noted her intent was not to confuse things by referring to the stars. She did not want to go through every item. She wanted to have this document so the Board had the opportunity to compare both. She believes there are a few changes that need to be made to the Vision and Design. There were a few things the Board discussed in detail at Patagonia that somehow slipped through the cracks.

Chairman Stewart noted that most of the changes are under Goal 2:4 (page 4 of the Board packet) – Pursue establishment of conservation programs/projects. On Objective 2:4B, the Board discussed in detail the Verde River Greenway that they wanted to continue acquiring properties along the Verde River consistent with the Board's expansion of the project area to Beasley Flats. The Board specifically wanted that wording in there. The acquisition of land was the key on the Verde.

Mr. Ream noted that he did not understand that the Board wanted that as part of the actual goal.

Chairman Stewart responded that the goal is not to have a group; the goal here is to acquire.

Chairman Stewart referred to 2:4E – Establish geographic working group on Santa Cruz River by the end of 2006 to assist other entities in protecting the Santa Cruz River properties.

Chairman Stewart noted that the Board discussed adding an additional Goal 2:6 – Develop a plan to acquire open space around existing parks necessary to protect current uses. One of the Objectives under that Goal would be to update the inventory of open

space needs by whatever date. The second Objective 2:6B would be to Establish a plan to acquire State Trust Land.

Chairman Stewart referred to Goal 2:5 – Pursue PAMS program for all parks. The Board talked about the fact that the Objective just talks about access for all employees. The Board was concerned that those components need to be included – establishing priority of components and core database tables. All that is contained in this document is “access”. If the PAMS program is being pursued and all that is included under “pursuing” it is access to all employees, it doesn’t get to the implementation.

Mr. Travous responded that staff are saying that is the main step for this next year.

Mr. Porter stated that was his thinking. It’s simply one more piece of fuel on the fire. He has a comfort zone with it. He would be uncomfortable if that were the same Objective next year. That would mean that objective was not accomplished this year. He expects to see other or additional objectives in the next Vision and Design.

Chairman Stewart responded that, at the very least, this year the Board would want a timeline for implementation. The Board has been mentioning for the last year or more that we need it.

Mr. Travous responded that that is the trouble staff are having. It says pursue access and establish priority of components. To give the Board a timeline is difficult. To be honest, he could make one up. It is so complicated that staff would spend so much time doing it that he doesn’t know it would be worth it. Staff are having difficulty because PAMS is much bigger than anyone thought it would be. Our bench is thin. Staff are doing it. When it comes time for Mr. McNeil to put the Library together, he is also trying to get a Reservation System going up on the Internet. That’s the difficulty. Staff hoped that, by showing major components, the Board would have the comfort level that staff are moving forward.

Chairman Stewart stated that she believes that the Board is comfortable in the sense that staff is very enthusiastic, are committed, and have done a fair amount of work. In terms of knowing how we’re doing, it’s helpful to have some of those things. However, it sounds like the Board is not going to get it.

Mr. Siegwarth noted that the current crunch in establishing the priority of components is there is a committee in place. A staff member says the water component should go in first; three park managers say their parks should be next; another staff member says biology is important. Right now we have a very good understanding of Lost Dutchman. If we go park-by-park, what happens to the park that’s last? It’s a long time before we get to that park. Or, because the Governor has priorities of water and staff have internal priorities relating to DEQ, do we do those components system-wide first so everyone has a piece of the puzzle. That gets to the point of what should the actual duties of the PAMS Manager be – prioritizing the components or inputting the components – and how should that work? Once the books are in the library, how do we then address the Science Manager. Should the PAMS Manager be the one who knows everything? Staff are very comfortable talking to Mr. Sejkora about water; staff are very comfortable talking to Mr. Ohr about DEQ issues. Do we really need someone above them to funnel that information to Executive Staff or should we be using those people.

When looking at a timeline, organizationally we say we want everyone to have access to the library. However, we really are in the midst of some very key, important discussions that are not resolved. There is a certain group that thinks we should do DEQ, Water, and Campground Reservation System because that's what we're doing – it basic infrastructure. If Ms. Roberts were here she would say that we need the biology, too. When looking at developing a new park or creating a master plan for an existing park, we might say let's do San Rafael first and then the rock climbing park. That will really determine what the PAMS Manager does. Until that's resolved, it's really hard to say how it will be rolled out over the next six months.

Chairman Stewart suggested putting it off until May. By then staff should have enough to have a sense of how to move forward and the Board would have some sense of what kinds of things timelines could be set for.

Mr. Siegwarth responded that that's why the Vision and Design says we'll give access because that is moving forward and we'll establish priority of components by the end of this year. Then, next year the Vision and Design would roll out the next step. Staff believe that establishing the priority of components is really a big step to take internally.

Mr. Ream added that when Mr. Travous handed Executive Staff the Vision and Design, he directed staff to look at it and if there's anything there that can't be done in this year he needed to know now. He noted that he will end up having to do these things while still having 30 parks to run.

Mr. Travous stated that he did not want to set staff up for failure.

Chairman Stewart stated that was fair enough. Since staff know that the Board will bring up this issue again in May, staff should be in a better position to tell the Board what the plan is and the direction staff are going.

Mr. Porter stated that he is paying heed to Mr. Cordasco's call for patience. He needed to hear that because, like the Chairman, he has been pushing. He has not, until the last Board meeting when he saw staff glowing during the PAMS presentation, really seen values and seen it come together. He now has a comfort zone and will start giving staff more patience than he would have up until now.

Chairman Stewart noted that progress has been made today. Staff identified some of the things that have to be decided before moving forward. Before, it was more like we just can't do it.

Mr. Cordasco suggested considering that when it comes to the different parks and which park gets the highest priority, in line with patience and in line with the Librarian concept, the person who is responsible for PAMS, the place that will potentially be the greatest resource isn't where you feel comfortable going to for answers about water or biology; it will be someone who can organize the 30 parks with protocols for something, say, as simple as monitoring processes. The design for the data collection is the most critical thing. If the resources and partnerships are in place at the universities and various other agencies that have skills to collect that data, and have that protocol to collect that data, all the parks can simultaneously be doing the same thing and it will be going into the library and be disseminated out in an efficient way to make decisions.

The assessment that came out on Red Rock State Park appeared to him to be a model of the direction for PAMS. It was very exciting. The question then seemed to be what park gets done next. That is not necessarily the approach to take. The approach to take is on a parks-wide basis at the same time so no one is left out and those protocols are put in place. Monitoring is the most basic thing there is and provides the most information that will end up going into the library and the GIS.

Mr. Ream noted that when staff does the final Environmental Assessments for the rock climbing park and does the Request For Proposal (RFP), it will require that it be delivered with the components necessary to put right into PAMS. Everything that comes from them will be in a format that can be plugged right into our database. Someone else will actually be doing it for us.

Mr. Cordasco added that staff will also be getting it packaged in a way that can be input to the rest of the parks. What he's really saying is that, sometimes rather than thinking in grand terms on all the science and research, take a step back and start with the most basic fundamentals that are inclusive of all the parks which are simply things like monitoring that even the park rangers should be able to collect. If they can't collect it, then there are partnerships that can be quickly forged that can provide assistance. All the parks would be collecting this data at the same time. It would also help financially, especially with partnerships. If we can use those outside resources to support the park rangers, the park rangers would be getting some added responsibility. To them, it won't be added responsibility. His guess would be that for most park rangers it would be what they've always really wanted to be doing. The outside resources will want to participate as well because that's what they want to do. What staff are really looking for now is a set of protocol – some fundamental information that is needed from all the state parks that goes into the GIS system. The next step would be disseminating that set of protocols to each individual park and informing them of what is needed from them. The parks could then go to a university and ask a biologist to come to the park to study something. Over time, with patience, it could be articulated and disseminated to Executive Staff for decision-making or to the Board for decision-making. This would probably maximize staff's efforts in a shorter period of time.

Chairman Stewart noted that ties in with the strategic plan regarding reaching out and forging closer association with the universities. In Patagonia there was discussion of a good project for a class at ASU or NAU or UA to take a project and do this.

Mr. Cordasco responded that the leadership for ASP in achieving its overall mission will be in how well staff articulate and design those sets of protocols. That's where the big deal is. It won't be to duplicate what the Forest Service did or what the NPS has done or what anyone else has done. It will be to understand what things do work and do not work in regard to scientific data collection. That's where the strength will be. Then, empower those individual parks themselves to create the partnerships and resources needed to collect that information.

Mr. Porter referred to the Vision and Design, Issue 2, Objective 2:2B, it says "grant recipients". He would like to see that become "grant applicants and recipients" because he believes that it would not be a bad thing to also get some of the applicants themselves involved in this process and educate and train them.

Chairman Stewart noted that if it only includes the recipients, it doesn't expand and grow.

### **Board Action**

**Mr. Porter:** I move that the Board approve the Vision and Design Plan with the change just outlined in Objective 2:2B under Goal 2:2 with the proposed changes outlined under Objectives 2:4B and 2:4E and with the addition of Goal 2:6 with its Objectives A and B.

Mr. Hays seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Stewart noted that the Board spent more time discussing this issue than planned, but she believes it was a good discussion. She felt that the Board finally has the sense that everyone is on the same page on this issue.

Chairman Stewart called for a Recess at 11:50 a.m.

Chairman Stewart reconvened the meeting at 12:03 p.m.

### **F. EXECUTIVE STAFF UPDATES**

- 1. Boating Restrictions at Patagonia Lake State Park** – No action will be taken at this meeting.

Chairman Stewart noted that no action will be taken on this issue. There is an additional report in the folders. She asked that the Board members remember to bring these materials to the Special Board meeting on November 4<sup>th</sup>, 2005 scheduled for 9:45 – 11:45 a.m.

Mr. Cordasco asked if the Agenda is set for that meeting.

Chairman Stewart responded that it is to consider the boating restrictions at Patagonia Lake State Park.

Mr. Cordasco asked if specific information can be included.

Chairman Stewart noted that Mr. Pawlik will make a presentation to the Board and that there will be some input from any members of the public who show up to discuss this issue.

Mr. Porter suggested that Mr. Cordasco's question is whether, at the meeting, the Board will be able to talk about every aspect of Patagonia Lake State Park. His feeling is that the answer would be yes.

Mr. Cordasco stated that he doesn't want to ask blind questions. He noted that he probably won't be at that meeting. There was a lot of talk about the Vision today and what comprises that Vision. He asked if there is a way to have a meeting regarding Patagonia Lake where the Board is able to have the agenda include the items that diversify the state parks in its values and have reports brought that way so that when the Board makes a decision in front of all those people they understand that the Board has taken into account the economics, management issues, the science aspects to the decisions, etc. This would give the Board an opportunity to do that. He doesn't know if that's something the Board wanted to do, but he would certainly not be interested in

just going to listen to a bunch of people talk about their thoughts and make a decision based on that. He thinks it would be an extraordinary time for the Board to display where ASP is at after the last several years in making that decision.

Chairman Stewart asked staff if they had a sense of what Mr. Cordasco is requesting.

Mr. Travous responded that he did, but noted that staff have not made this effort in that context. There is information that staff could put together and bring along.

Chairman Stewart suggested that in making its final decision, the Board could consider some of those things. Even though it hasn't been brought to the Board to this point with some of those things in mind, some of the public have alluded to various things. To the extent that staff can bring additional information that would be relevant, they should do so. The Board has discussed issues in the past relating to pollution of the water. Any of those things that staff feel they have information on from a management standpoint and a policy standpoint that would be relevant should be included.

Mr. Cordasco stated that this is a great opportunity to do the best the Board can to stand on where we're at today in trying to make this decision and not approach it the way it would have been approached prior to 2003. It should be a science-informed, economic-informed, legislative-informed, management-informed decision. Those are the categories the Board is focused on. All of those areas need to be brought up and presented in order for the Board to make a decision that best fits the ASP in the context of Patagonia Lake. If that meeting can be organized and structured that way, then the Board has something to refer to while listening to the public comments – which will lean heavily to one side or the other. By referring to some of these other aspects and values, the Board can call on them to be more broad minded. If they can't do that, then to at least appreciate why the Board might make whatever decision it does.

Mr. Travous stated that staff would provide all the information they can. Regarding what is not available, staff will point to their weaknesses in what they don't have.

## **2. Update on Climbing Park**

Chairman Stewart noted that the information provided in the Board packet (page 68-A) refers to a public rollout by the end of October.

Mr. Travous responded that the public rollout might be the hearings in Washington, DC. He has not received the exact dates on that yet. There have been meetings with staffs of legislators (Grijalva, Kyle, Lindsay). Staff are working on setting up a meeting between Mr. Travous and Senator Kyle in the next couple of weeks.

Chairman Stewart asked that staff keep the Board informed by E-mail if there is any significant that arises. She reminded the Board that if any of the Board members have a response to staff they should NOT Reply All.

Mr. Cordasco asked how the climbing park looks from an economic perspective.

Mr. Siegwarth responded that staff are very encouraged that it will be a strong performer. Staff have not gotten to the point of establishing fees. He hesitates mainly because one of the issues will be parking; another will be campsites. If those things work out, he believes visitation will be very high.

Chairman Stewart noted that capital improvements should be fairly minimal. Less is more to the targeted audience. They like to keep the cost low.

Mr. Siegwarth responded that the trail system, if done right, will be expensive. Water will require some funding.

Mr. Ream added that, including the road, the total package should be around \$6 million.

Chairman Stewart noted that some of that cost will be borne by other entities. She asked if staff are looking at use of environmentally-sensitive materials and designs. This is a park where, particularly, the audience will be expecting and appreciating that.

Mr. Travous responded that those are the very discussions staff are having with the interdisciplinary group right now.

### **3. Update on Budget Discussions**

Mr. Travous noted that staff do not know what the Governor's budget recommendation will be. Staff did send another note to our representative in her office. Visitation was down in September because the gas prices spiked. That puts us more behind the 8 ball. A message was sent to the Governor's Office last week reminding that we must pay attention to this.

Chairman Stewart noted that with all the emphasis on the national parks and how they haven't had any budget for capital improvements and how they are falling apart, it would be a real opportunity to give specific examples of our historic parks. Generally, just saying we need all this extra money because we haven't been able to do all the things we wanted to do is not enough. The Governor was impressed with some of the problems we are having at McFarland when she was there. She noticed the cracks in the wall. Highlighting some of those is important. Money for something like that where there's a real danger of something falling apart as opposed to it would be nice to have a new visitors center is sometimes easier to sell. It's not that we don't need a new visitors center equally as much.

### **4. Proposed 2006 Legislation**

Mr. Porter referred to the second piece of proposed legislation dealing with the State Parks Reservation Surcharge Fund. He asked what the real chances, realistically, are of that passing.

Mr. Ziemann responded he felt it was better than 50/50.

Chairman Stewart noted that she believes when agencies earn the money they have a better chance.

Mr. Ziemann reported that Senator Burns is the Appropriations Chair. He will discuss this proposal with him next Thursday morning. The legislature set up the Reservation Surcharge account to allow the agency to create a reservation system. This cap is keeping the agency from doing that. Staff need to go out to bid to do these things. We can't go out to bid until all the money is in the bank. As soon as July 1 rolls around, all the money reverts. It isn't working. Whether the cap is completely removed or time extended, he believes there is a better than 50/50 chance of getting the statute amended.

Chairman Stewart asked if there is a possibility, should the legislature not be inclined to increase the amount, that they would extend the period of time the agency could hold on to the money.

Mr. Ziemann responded that they go by fiscal years. He supposed they could do session law, but that would go for a year and then revert back to the way it was. He would prefer to fix the statute.

#### **5. Update on Tram at Catalina State Park**

Chairman Stewart stated that this is something that the Board will need to get into in the near future.

Mr. Travous reported that Pima County has been out to bid a Request for Engineers Proposal on a tram to go up the side of Mt. Lemmon. After the fires on Mt. Lemmon, they are looking for alternate ways to get people up the mountain other than the long roads in. This idea has come up before; it has raised its head again. The County is putting up money to see if it makes economic sense and can be done from a variety of standpoints. He is on the committee to select the engineer. He was invited yesterday to be on the advisory committee for the entire process. Currently, the question is whether it is a go or no-go. It will impact the eastern edge of Catalina State Park.

Chairman Stewart asked if this study will study the impacts on the park or if it will only study whether it will be a money-maker for the County.

Mr. Travous responded that if it's done right it will study all those things.

Chairman Stewart stated that, along with the earlier discussions, the Board will certainly want to know some of that information and how our visitors feel about this before deciding whether or not to support it.

Mr. Hays asked how financially successful the trams at Albuquerque and Palm Springs have been.

Mr. Travous responded that the tram at Palm Springs is very successful. Curiously, the top of the mountain is a state park that can only be gotten to by using that tram. The other tram in Albuquerque isn't as effective. However, they both get more than 300,000 riders a year. Regarding this tram, if it takes a two-stage tram to get up the mountain, the economics probably won't work. If it can be done with one rope all the way to the top, it will be the longest in the world. It will also be less expensive. The single rope is an engineering challenge.

#### **6. San Rafael Easement**

Mr. Travous reported that, the last he heard, no news is good news. Everything is going well.

Chairman Stewart noted that there are people out there performing monitoring.

Mr. Ream reported that staff have found that if letters are sent certified mail that include the agency's exact intent, there are no problems with Mr. Humphreys. Staff are now working on getting a copy of the Ranch Management Plan. That will be the next hurdle. This was a successful year.

## **7. Update on Mabery Judgment**

Chairman Stewart stated that there is nothing new to report.

**G. EXECUTIVE SESSION** – Upon a public majority vote, the Board may hold an Executive Session which is not open to the public for the following purposes:

- 1. To discuss or consult with its legal counsel for legal advice on matters listed on this agenda pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(3), including:**
  - a. Mabery Easement Dispute Litigation**
- 2. To discuss or consult with its legal counsel in order to consider its position and instruct its attorneys regarding the Board's position regarding contracts that are the subject of negotiations, in pending or contemplated litigation or in settlement discussions conducted in order to avoid or resolve litigation pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(4)**
  - a. Mabery Easement Dispute Litigation**
- 3. To discuss or consult with designated representatives of the Board in order to consider its position and instruct its representatives regarding negotiations for the purchase, sale or lease of real property per A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(7)**
  - a. Picacho Peak Land Purchase**

Mr. Porter made a motion to go into Executive Session as noticed in the Agenda.

Mr. Hays seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. Executive Session was convened at 12:21 p.m.

Chairman Stewart reconvened the meeting at 12:33 p.m.

## **H. ACTION ITEMS FROM EXECUTIVE SESSION**

### **1. Mabery Easement Dispute Litigation**

There was no action on this item.

### **2. Picacho Peak Land Purchase**

#### **Board Action**

Mr. Porter: I move that the Arizona State Parks Board authorize staff to purchase the 10-acre so-called Barber property at Picacho Peak State Park consistent with park land acquisition process and other Board-approved procedures up to the appraised value and consistent with the Board's discussions in Executive Session.

Mr. Hays seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Ream reminded everyone that the information sheet provided to the Board is an Executive Session document and is to be kept separate from the Board's other documents.

## **I. ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL DISCUSSION ITEMS**

- 1. Discussion of Attorney General Opinion 105-004 Open Meeting Law Requirements and E-Mail To and From Members of a Public Body**

Chairman Stewart noted the Board received this information a couple of months ago. Ms. Boland is prepared to answer any questions the Board may have.

Ms. Boland admonished the Board that E-mail is a dangerous tool under the Open Meeting Law. The Board can communicate with staff because that does not involve deliberations. The "Reply All" command must never be used. Factual information should not be shared. If it's factual information it deals with something that might come before the Board for discussion or action. Use E-mail sparingly. She does not believe any Board member would consciously use E-mail to circumvent the law. It can happen accidentally.

#### **J. CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

There was no public present at this point in the meeting.

#### **K. ITEMS AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING AND CALL FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

- 1. Staff recommends that a Special Arizona State Parks Board Meeting be held in Phoenix, AZ the first week of November, 2005 (probably November 4<sup>th</sup>) to discuss Boating Restrictions at Patagonia Lake State Park.**

Mr. Porter noted his understanding that the Board has a very specifically set time period for the Special Meeting on November 4<sup>th</sup> from 9:45 to 11:45 a.m. He asked if that puts the Board in any danger of looking like they are just going through motions. Two hours may not be enough time if a lot of people show. He suggested starting earlier. He suggested beginning at 9:00 a.m.

Chairman Stewart noted that the meeting is in the Board Room at the Phoenix Office (1300 W. Washington Street). She is not sure how many people may come to the meeting to give public testimony.

Mr. Travous suggested not starting the public part of the meeting until 9:45 a.m. so any public coming up from Tucson have time to get there. He noted that it has been astoundingly quiet. There were some things sent to the Governor's office. There might not be many people coming to that meeting. Generally, the roar would have already started. He would hate, on the one hand, to call everyone in for the meeting and have no one show up. At the same time, to not do it is to not treat the public in the right way.

Mr. Porter agreed that this is the appropriate way to do it. He would prefer to begin the meeting at 9:00 a.m.

Mr. Travous suggested that the presentations by staff could begin at 9:00 a.m.

Mr. Cordasco asked if one of those presentations would be on the safety enforcement.

Mr. Travous responded that he believes that is what Mr. Pawlik will present; other staff will put additional information together.

Mr. Travous asked if the Board wished to keep the Adjournment at a time certain of 11:45 a.m.

Chairman Stewart responded that on something like this, where it's a single-item Agenda, it is appropriate.

Mr. Porter noted that the key things will have been said by 11:45 a.m. That gives the Board the opportunity to say the point has been reached for action.

Mr. Cordasco asked if, in a situation like this where there are conflicting interests and uses regarding a state park, there has ever been a process by which that park initiated a process by which the surrounding communities and other interested groups participated in some process to work it out themselves to create a plan that has the ownership quality and was developed from the grassroots up rather than a mandate down.

Mr. Travous responded that that has not occurred to this juncture. For example, 15 years ago the Board was looking at this same issue at Patagonia Lake State Park. Public meetings were held to receive input. The outcome was that the lake was zoned for wake and no wakes and on weekends. From that perspective, it was a public planning process. If the Board look at the information provided, then that is a public planning process, from that perspective. If the Board look at information they sent with their ideas, then the public has given the Board input.

Ms. Boland suggested that the Board doesn't really want an end-time on the meeting. The Chairman can announce that the Board will adjourn by 11:45 a.m. without putting it on the Agenda. She would hate for someone to show up at 11:30 a.m. and the Board is already done.

Mr. Hays asked whether the Board could continue past 11:45 if necessary.

Chairman Stewart noted that there may not be a quorum present. If a quorum is present, the Board could continue. However, she must leave at 11:45.

Mr. Porter stated that on an issue like this, he would like the Chairman's vote. He would like to have this meeting ended by 11:45.

Chairman Stewart stated that if the Board feels it needs more than 2 hours and 45 minutes then the meeting can begin earlier.

Mr. Travous stated that, with the feedback he's received so far, he will be surprised if there is a large public turnout.

Mr. Porter noted that a strict timeline for speaking can be applied. There was a lot of public feedback provided several years ago at a meeting at Tonto. That part of the meeting went rather fast.

**2. Staff recommends that the next Arizona State Parks Board Meeting be held in Yuma, AZ on November 17, 2005.**

Chairman Stewart expressed her desire to hold the meeting at Yuma Crossing State Park, space permitting.

Mr. Ream reported that he has been working with the City of Yuma on this meeting. They requested that the Board meet at their City Hall. They would like the Board to come to Yuma the day before. The Heritage Area will provide a dinner for the Board that evening (November 16). The meeting will be the next morning (November 17). He has arranged for tours at both Yuma Territorial Prison and Yuma Crossing State Parks. The tours will begin at 4:00 p.m.

Chairman Stewart asked how many Board members would be able to be in Yuma on Wednesday, November 16.

Mr. Cordasco stated that he would have to check his schedule in the office. He will be going to Amarillo, TX a few days before that. He may not get back until the night of the 16<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Chilton stated she could probably be there on the 16<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Ream stated that the relationship with the City of Yuma will be showcased (exhibits, Master Plan, ASP and City of Yuma money being matched for the Crossing).

Mr. Porter noted that the Arizona Historical Society has property there, too. He would like to see them brought in, as much as possible, and perhaps invite Anne Woosley and Norma Colter to the meeting as well as the dinner the night before.

Chairman Stewart suggested that they be placed on the Agenda.

Mr. Travous suggested also inviting the legislators from that district to the meeting as well.

Chairman Stewart suggested staying at the new Holiday Inn.

Mr. Ream responded that he was considering staying at the Best Western because they have such a great breakfast.

Mr. Porter and Mr. Hays stated they would be there for the dinner on the 16<sup>th</sup> as well.

**3. Board members may wish to discuss issues of concern and request staff to place specific items on future meeting agendas.**

Chairman Stewart requested the State Heritage Area Program and activities SHPO has been working on placed on the Agenda.

Mr. Ziemann noted that much of that program has been put on hold.

Chairman Stewart stated that she spoke with them recently and they would like to discuss the concept and the work they've been doing. The Board needs to be apprised of that work because as Board members are out in the community they will be hearing about these things.

Chairman Stewart suggested formal recognition of the Site Stewards program that won 3 national awards. She requested Ms. Estes come to the meeting for that formal recognition.

Mr. Porter requested an update on Lake Havasu. He and Mr. Travous anticipate that prior to that meeting they will have met with the new power structure in Lake Havasu.

Chairman Stewart requested an update on the contract with the Foundation and the list of priorities.

Chairman Stewart announced that she was at McFarland State Park with the Governor when she declared it an Arizona treasure. Staff did an excellent job of preparing for that event and showing the Governor the park. There were more than 150 people there. It was a good event and gives the Board a springboard to really involve the community

in the park. It was full of children and families who were local. People were enthusiastic. The Governor mentioned that she wants us to get more kids to the park.

Chairman Stewart announced that ASP is a major sponsor of Conservation Summit next Friday and Saturday in Casa Grande. They have an interesting Agenda on water issues on the Colorado River and other places.

Mr. Porter noted that there is a staff training conference next week (Tuesday and Wednesday) in Parker. It strikes him that if it were possible Board members should at least stop in and make a showing. He thinks the staff would probably appreciate it. He will have a difficult time making it happen because of some obligations he has.

Chairman Stewart noted that she's heard positive comments from staff about the fact the Mr. Hays attended a while back.

Mr. Travous stated that the best time to come would be during the banquet when the awards are presented. That banquet will be Wednesday evening from 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m. at the Blue Water Casino.

Mr. Travous noted that he will host the Board of the National Park Trust next Friday and Saturday.

Chairman Stewart asked the Board and staff to provide her with any information she should mention at the Conservation Summit regarding what we are doing in the conservation area.

Mr. Travous noted that Mr. Shein is putting a booklet together on a presentation staff made regarding the State Trust Lands and its impact on parks to hand out.

Mr. Porter, referring to the employee training conference, noted that there are banquets on both Tuesday and Wednesday nights where awards will be presented. He asked which would be the better of the two for Board members to attend.

Mr. Ream responded that either would be good. Employee awards will be presented on Tuesday night; the state service awards will be presented Wednesday night.

Chairman Stewart asked if the Vision and Design will be discussed.

Mr. Ream responded that Mr. Travous will speak on that on Tuesday at 4:40 p.m.

Mr. Porter stated that he would try to come to the conference on Tuesday for that discussion and stay for the banquet that night.

Chairman Stewart stated that she would see if she can make arrangements to come for part of the conference.

## **L. ADJOURNMENT**

Chairman Stewart adjourned the meeting at 12:58 p.m.

\*\*\*\*

Pursuant to Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), Arizona State Parks does not discriminate on the basis of a disability regarding admission to public meetings. Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation, such as a sign language interpreter, by contacting the ADA Coordinator, Nicole Armstrong-Best, (602) 542-7152; or TTY (602) 542-4174. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation.

SUBMITTED BY:

---

Kenneth E. Travous, Executive Director

APPROVED BY:

---

Elizabeth Stewart, Chairman